## CLEARY GOTTLIEB STEEN & HAMILTON LLP

ONE LIBERTY PLAZA

NEW YORK, NY 10006-1470

(212) 225-2000

FACSIMILE (212) 225-3999

WWW.CLEARYGOTTLIEB.COM

WASHINGTON, DC · PARIS · BRUSSELS · LONDON · MOSCOW FRANKFURT · COLOGNE · ROME · MILAN · HONG KONG BELIING · BUENOS AIRES · SÃO PAULO · ABU DHABI · SEOUL

> Writer's Direct Dial: +1 212 225-2840 E-Mail: lfriedman@cgsh.com

LAURENT ALPERT
VICTOR I LEWKOW
LESLIE N SILVERMAN
ROBERT L TORTORIELO
LEE G BUCHHEIT
JAMES M. PEASLEE
THOMAS J MOLONEY
DAVID G ABEL
JONATHAN I BLACKMAN
MICHAEL I FYAN
ROBERT P. DAVIS
ROCHERT P. DAVIS
ROCHERT P. DAVIS
ROCHERT P. DAVIS
STEVEN G HOROWITZ
JAMES A DUNCAN
STEVEN M. LOEB
CRAIG B BROD
MITCHELL A. LOWENTHAL
EDWARD J ROSEN
LAWRENCE B FREDMAN
NICOLAS GRAFAR
MICHAEL J AUSTIN
SETH CROSSIMANOLER
WILLIAM A GROLL
HCWARD S ZELBO
DAVID E BRODSKY
ARTHUR H KOHN
SICHARD J COOPER
JEFFREY S. LEWIS
PAUL J SYMINER
STEVEN L WILLIAM
ANDRES DE LA CRUZ
DAVID C LOFFEZ
CARMEN A CORRALES
JAMES L BROMLEY
MICHAEL A GERSTENZANG
LEWS J LIMAN

ELIZABETH LENAS
LUXE A BAREFOOT
FAMELA L MARCOGLIESE
FAUL M TIGER
JONATHAN S KOLODNER
DANIEL ILAN
MEYER H FEDIDA
ADIAN SEIGHSIG
ADIAN SEIGHSIG
ADAM BERSHEMAN
ARI D. MACKINNON
RESIDENT PARTNERS
TAMES CONTROL MARCE LANGSTON
RESIDENT PARTNERS

SANDRA M ROCKS
S DOUGLAS BORISKY
DOUGLAS BORISKY
DAVID E WEBB
PENELOPE L CHRISTOPHOROU
BOAZ S MORAG
MARY S ALCOCK
DAVID H HERRINGTON
HEIDE H LEGENFRITZ
HUGH C CONROY, JR
KATHLEEN M EMBERGER
WATHACE L LOTT
ANDREW WEAVER
HELENA K GRANNIS
GRANT M BINDER
JOHN V HARRISON
CAROLINE HAYDAY
DAVID FLECHNER
RESIDENT COUNSEL

LOUISE M PARENT OF COUNSEL

October 16, 2015

## BY ECF AND HAND

Hon. Dora L. Irizarry, U.S.D.J. United States District Court 225 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, New York 11201

Re: Strauss, et al. v. Crédit Lyonnais, S.A., 06-cv-702 (DLI) (MDG)
Wolf, et al. v. Crédit Lyonnais, S.A., 07-cv-914 (DLI) (MDG)
Weiss, et al. v. National Westminster Bank Plc, 05-cv-4622 (DLI) (MDG)
Applebaum, et al. v. National Westminster Bank Plc, 07-cv-916 (DLI) (MDG)

## Dear Judge Irizarry:

Pursuant to the Court's instructions at the October 8, 2015 oral argument on the pending summary judgment and dismissal motions by defendants Crédit Lyonnais, S.A. ("CL") and National Westminster Bank Plc ("NatWest"), I am writing to provide the Court with (1) citations to the precedents to which I referred, (2) information requested by the Court concerning CL's and NatWest's wire transfers that contacted the United States and on which plaintiffs base their claims, and (3) a copy of the demonstrative exhibit that I provided to the Court and to plaintiffs' counsel.

First, in addition to the authorities referenced in CL's and NatWest's briefs in support of their respective motions, I referred the Court to the following precedents:

Stroud v. Tyson Foods, Inc., No. 14-Civ-3281, 2015 WL 1034452, at \*3-6 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 10, 2015) (Irizarry, J.) (no general jurisdiction over corporations that are neither incorporated nor headquartered in New York).

Hon. Dora L. Irizarry, U.S.D.J., p.2

- 7 W. 57th St. Realty Co., LLC v. Citigroup, Inc., No. 13-Civ-981, 2015 WL 1514539, at \*5-7, 11 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 31, 2015) (Gardephe, J.) (foreign bank defendants' pre-<u>Daimler</u> participation in lawsuit did not waive personal jurisdiction defense because, under <u>Gucci America</u>, <u>Daimler</u> "effected a change in the law"; New York Banking Law Section 200 "limits any consent to personal jurisdiction by registered banks to specific personal jurisdiction").
- Laydon v. Mizuho Bank, Ltd., No. 12-Civ-3419, 2015 WL 1499185, at \*6 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 31, 2015) (Daniels, J.) (foreign bank defendants did not waive personal jurisdiction defense pre-<u>Daimler</u> because their "defense was not available," but did waive their defense by failing to raise it promptly post-<u>Daimler</u>).
- Motorola Credit Corp. v. Uzan, No. 02-Civ-666, 2015 WL 5613077, at \*2 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 9, 2015) (Rakoff, J.) (no general jurisdiction over foreign banks that are "incorporated and maintain their principal places of business abroad, and no 'exceptional circumstances' exist that would otherwise support general jurisdiction over them," no waiver of foreign banks' jurisdictional objections because "objections to jurisdiction were not available before <u>Daimler</u> and <u>Gucci</u>," nor did any waiver occur as a result of their licensing in New York).
- In re LIBOR-Based Fin. Instruments Antitrust Litig., No. 11 MDL 2262 NRB, 2015 WL 4634541, at \*26-27 & n. 54 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 4, 2015) (Buchwald, J.) (exercise of specific jurisdiction over foreign banks is appropriate only "[t]o the extent that" plaintiffs' claims arose from LIBOR manipulation that occurred in the forum; a "bank that cooperated with a request made by a trader in New York would be subject to personal jurisdiction in New York in connection with a claim arising out of that request," but "allegations of some misconduct in New York do not support personal jurisdiction as to" claims arising out of defendants' conduct "in London or elsewhere abroad").
- Weisblum v. Prophase Labs, Inc., No. 14-Civ-3587, 2015 WL 738112, at \*5 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 20, 2015) (Furman, J.) ("[T]he Court cannot override [defendant's personal jurisdiction] objections in the name of 'judicial efficiency' . . . . ").
- <u>Hargrave v. Oki Nursery</u>, 646 F.2d 716, 718 (2d Cir. 1980) (court can exercise pendent personal jurisdiction over a claim despite the absence of a statutory provision authorizing service, but only if that claim arises from the same common nucleus of operative fact as a claim for which there is statutory jurisdiction and only if "[t]here is no constitutional issue as to whether the district court has . . . personal jurisdiction over the defendant with respect to all the claims").

Second, the parties agree that CL made five transfers at the request of its customer CBSP that contacted the United States and on which plaintiffs base their claims. Those five transfers constitute 0.9% of the 550 transfers that CL made at CBSP's request, and total \$205,000.

Hon. Dora L. Irizarry, U.S.D.J., p.3

The parties also agree that NatWest made 196 transfers at the request of its customer Interpal that contacted the United States and on which plaintiffs base their claims. Those transfers total \$4,345,342.35.

Third, a copy of the timeline that I provided to the Court as a demonstrative exhibit at oral argument, which illustrates CL's five transfers that contacted New York, is attached to this letter as Exhibit A.

Respectfully,

Lawrence B. Friedman

Attachment

cc: All counsel

## **EXHIBIT A**

